

Pseudospin SU(2) Symmetry Breaking, Charge Density Wave and Superconductivity in the Hubbard Model

Shun-Qing Shen and X. C. Xie

Department of Physics, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK 74078

In this paper, we discuss physical consequences of pseudospin SU(2) symmetry breaking in the negative-U Hubbard model at half-filling. If pseudospin symmetry is spontaneously broken while its unique subgroup U(1) remains invariant, it will lead to the charge density wave (CDW) ground state. Furthermore, if the U(1) symmetry is also broken, the ground state will have the off-diagonal long range order (ODLRO), signaling a superconductor. In this case, CDW and superconductivity coexist to form a supersolid. Finally, we show that CDW suppresses, but does not destroy superconductivity.

PACS No: 74.65+n, 74.20-z

The spontaneous symmetry breaking in the condensed matter systems may produce some physically observable consequences [1]. For example, superfluid or superconductivity comes from the U(1) symmetry breaking, and ferromagnet and antiferromagnet in a spin isotropic system comes from the spontaneous spin SU(2) symmetry breaking. Pseudospin SU(2) symmetry firstly discovered in Kondo lattice model [2] and one-band Hubbard model [3–5] is a novel kind of rotation invariance in the particle-hole space, and has a dual relationship with the usual spin symmetry [6,7]. It has intrigued a lot of interests among theoretical physicists and many studies have been carried out in this direction. By using pseudospin operators, Yang [3] has proposed the so-called “ η -pairing” mechanism of superconductivity and his idea was later realized in the ground states of the negative-U case [6,8]. Zhang has discussed the physical consequences of pseudospin SU(2) symmetry breaking in the “ η -pairing” superconductor [5]. Another important outcome of pseudospin SU(2) symmetry is the coexistence of the charge density wave and superconductivity, namely supersolid. By using the partial particle-hole transformation [9], it is shown that antiferromagnetic ground state with positive U at half filling corresponds to a supersolid of negative U. Therefore, in the negative Hubbard model there is a possible coexistence of superconductor characterized by the ODLRO and charge density wave (CDW) characterized by the diagonal long-range order (DLRO). Usually, ODLRO is a characteristic of superconductivity, but in a supersolid with both ODLRO and DLRO whether this is still true is an open question. Authors in Ref. [12] have concluded that the critical magnetic field for a supersolid with pseudospin symmetry must be zero since superconductor can freely rotate to the CDW state because of the SU(2) symmetry and degeneracy. This leads to the question of understanding the superconducting properties in a supersolid.

In this paper, we discuss some physical consequences of pseudospin SU(2) symmetry in the negative-U Hubbard model. First, we show that if pseudospin symmetry is spontaneously broken while its unique subgroup U(1) remains invariant, it will lead to the CDW ground state, and the appearance of two massless collective modes according to Goldstone theorem [14]. Second, if the U(1) symmetry is also broken, the ground state will have the ODLRO, signaling a superconductor. In this case, the ODLRO and CDW coexist and form a supersolid. U(1) symmetry breaking will also give rise to a third branch of massless mode. Finally, we discuss the superconducting properties in a supersolid. We show that CDW suppresses, but does not destroy superconductivity, and supersolid exhibits both Meissner effect and zero resistance. We also calculate the penetration depth in terms of the order parameters for superconductor and CDW. It should be emphasized that the traditional view considering CDW as produced by breaking of the

translational symmetry which is a discrete symmetry in the Hubbard model. The significance of our work is that we find additional continuous symmetry for CDW which has important physical consequences (like Goldstone bosons). Our finding of the relation between CDW and pseudospin may not restrict to the Hubbard model. For example, the pseudospin symmetry is also exist in the Su-Schrieffer-Heeger hamiltonian [13] for describing one-dimensional polymer and CDW in that system can also be considered as breaking of pseudospin symmetry.

The one-band Hubbard model on a bipartite lattice Λ of A and B is defined by the Hamiltonian

$$H = -t \sum_{\langle ij \rangle, \sigma} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + \frac{2}{3}U \sum_{i \in \Lambda} \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_i \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_i + 2\mu \sum_{i \in \Lambda} \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_i^z \quad (1)$$

where $c_{i\sigma}^\dagger$ and $c_{i\sigma}$ are the creation and annihilation operators of electron with spin σ at site i , respectively. The summation of $\langle ij \rangle$ runs over all possible nearest neighbour pairs. μ is the chemical potential and determined by the electron density. $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_i$ is pseudospin operator and is defined by

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_i^+ = \epsilon(i)c_{i\uparrow}c_{i\downarrow} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_i^- = \epsilon(i)c_{i\downarrow}^\dagger c_{i\uparrow}^\dagger \\ \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_i^z = \frac{1}{2}(1 - n_{i\uparrow} - n_{i\downarrow}) \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where $\epsilon(i) = +1$ for $i \in A$, and -1 for $i \in B$. They obey the commutation relation of the spin operators. The total pseudospin operator is $\tilde{\mathbf{S}} = \sum_i \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_i$, and its three components can be used as the generators to construct a SU(2) group. The Hamiltonian in Eq.(1) has the commutation relation,

$$[H, \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^\pm] = \mp 2\mu \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^\pm; \quad [H, \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^z] = 0 \quad (3)$$

Therefore, when $\mu = 0$, H has pseudospin SU(2) symmetry, and when $\mu \neq 0$, the symmetry is explicitly broken by the term containing the chemical potential. The latter is very similar to the isotropic spin Heisenberg model in the presence of an external magnetic field. On the other hand, $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^z$ always commutes with the Hamiltonian. Thus, the total number of the electrons is conserved, and the Hamiltonian always possesses U(1) symmetry, which is the unique subgroup of SU(2). In this paper, we are interested in the physical consequences of spontaneous SU(2) symmetry breaking and for our purpose we shall only discuss the case with $\mu = 0$. In this case, if the ground state does not possesses the SU(2) symmetry as the Hamiltonian has, the spontaneous symmetry breaking occurs.

From the structure of SU(2) group, there are two possibilities for the pseudospin symmetry being spontaneously broken: i) the SU(2) symmetry is breaking while its subgroup U(1) remains invariant; and ii) U(1) symmetry is also broken. We show that Case i) will produce the CDW ground state. From the definition of pseudospin operator, its z-component is related to the charge density, and its corresponding long-range order is CDW. The CDW state at half filling with the order parameter $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N_\Lambda}} \tilde{S}_Q^z = \frac{1}{N_\Lambda} \sum_i \epsilon(i) \langle \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_i^z \rangle = -\frac{1}{2N_\Lambda} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} \langle c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}+\pi, \sigma} + c_{\mathbf{k}+\pi, \sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} \rangle$ can be expressed as

$$|CDW\rangle = \prod_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} (u_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^\dagger + v_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}+\pi, \sigma}^\dagger) |0\rangle \quad (4)$$

with $\frac{1}{N_\Lambda} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} u_{\mathbf{k}} v_{\mathbf{k}} \neq 0$, where the $\mathbf{k}$ is within half of the Brillouin zone. Although we have $\langle CDW | \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^\pm | CDW \rangle = \langle CDW | \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^z | CDW \rangle = 0$, but only $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^z | CDW \rangle = 0$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^\pm | CDW \rangle \neq 0$. The SU(2) symmetry in a state has been broken unless all eigenvalues for the operator $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}$ are zero. Therefore, $|CDW\rangle$ keeps the conservation of the particle number (or U(1) symmetry) and destroys the SU(2) symmetry at the same time.

One of the strong evidences to support CDW as product of pseudospin symmetry breaking is the existence of massless modes, i.e., Goldstone bosons. According to Goldstone theorem, when a continuous symmetry is spontaneously broken, there must exist some massless modes. The appearance of CDW will produce two massless modes. To see this, we first come to consider the following correlation functions

$$F_+(t, t') = -i\theta(t - t')\langle[\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^+(t), \sum_i \epsilon(i)\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_i^-(t')]\rangle, \quad (5)$$

$$F_-(t, t') = -i\theta(t - t')\langle[\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^-(t), \sum_i \epsilon(i)\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_i^+(t')]\rangle, \quad (6)$$

where $\langle \cdots \rangle$ implies the thermodynamic average. By using the commutation relation between pseudospin operators and the Hamiltonian, we have

$$F_{\pm}(\omega) = \frac{2\langle \sum_i \epsilon(i)\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_i^z \rangle}{\omega \mp 2\mu + i\delta} \quad (7)$$

If the CDW order parameter $\langle \sum_i \epsilon(i)\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_i^z \rangle / N_{\Lambda} \neq 0$, then there are two collective modes $\omega_0 = \pm 2|\mu|$. It should be noticed that if the chemical potential μ is not equal to zero, i.e., the symmetry is explicitly broken, the two collective modes are massive. If the CDW state arises at half filling case which are our interests in this paper, then $\mu = 0$ and there appear two massless modes according to Eq.(7). Eq.(7) illustrates that it is the symmetry breaking CDW ground state which produces the two massless modes. We should point out that only one branch is directly observable because the other one is of negative energy.

The Case (ii) will lead to the coexistence of CDW and superconductivity. As is well known, the U(1) symmetry breaking gives rise to a superconductor. The BCS superconducting state with an order parameter $\langle c_{\mathbf{k},\uparrow}^\dagger c_{-\mathbf{k},\downarrow}^\dagger \rangle$ can be written as

$$|BCS\rangle = \prod_{\mathbf{k}} (u_{\mathbf{k}} + v_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k},\uparrow}^\dagger c_{-\mathbf{k},\downarrow}^\dagger) |0\rangle, \quad (8)$$

here the $\mathbf{k}$ is within Brillouin zone. Clearly, $|BCS\rangle$ breaks the conservation of the particle number since $|BCS\rangle$ is not an eigenstate of $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^z$. The superconductivity in a system with pseudospin symmetry can be understood as following. Pseudospin operators, like the usual spin-1/2 operators, can be regarded as operator for hard-core bosons. The raising and lowering operators consist of the local singlet pairs of electrons. Obviously, no two pairs can occupy one site due to the Pauli principle. If the hard core bosons condensate macroscopically at a low temperature, it gives rise to superconductivity (the boson here has charge $2e$). If the condensation happens at the momentum $\mathbf{q} = \pi$, the order parameter can be written as $\langle \frac{1}{N_{\Lambda}} \sum_i \exp(i\mathbf{q} \cdot \pi) \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_i^+ \rangle = \frac{1}{N_{\Lambda}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \langle c_{\mathbf{k},\uparrow} c_{-\mathbf{k},\downarrow} \rangle$, which is that of the usual BCS superconductor. If the condensation happens at $\mathbf{q} = 0$, its order parameter is $\langle \frac{1}{N_{\Lambda}} \sum_i \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_i^+ \rangle = \frac{1}{N_{\Lambda}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \langle c_{\mathbf{k}+\pi,\uparrow} c_{-\mathbf{k},\downarrow} \rangle$. In this case, pseudospin obeys the relationship $\tilde{S}^2 - \tilde{S}_z^2 = O(N_e^2)$, which is the criteria for the η -pairing superconductor as Yang proposed [3]. Such a phenomenon only happens in the ground state of the negative U case with $2N_A > N_e > 2N_B$, and there, it is found that $|\langle \sum_i \epsilon(i)\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_i \rangle| > |\langle \sum_i \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_i \rangle|$. Thus, the two kinds of ODLROs must coexist in the η -pairing superconductor. When the condensation occurs, adding or decreasing a boson in the condensate does not change the total energy. Thus the chemical potential μ is equal to zero. Furthermore, the condensation also breaks the U(1) symmetry in the thermodynamic limit. Therefore, *the local pairing superconductivity is product of both pseudospin SU(2) and U(1) symmetries spontaneously breaking*. The U(1) breaking should give rise to another

massless mode [15]. Together with the two massless modes produced by CDW, there are three massless modes while U(1) symmetry is also broken. Since the U(1) group is the unique subgroup of SU(2), the SU(2) symmetry must be also broken when U(1) is broken. Therefore, in this case, the CDW and superconductivity must coexist. *The SU(2) and U(1) symmetry spontaneously breaking gives rise to a supersolid.* Furthermore, the T_c for CDW is always higher than the T_c for superconductivity since U(1) breaking always happens after SU(2) symmetry breaking.

Next we come to discuss the the diamagnetism and resistance in a supersolid as a product of spontaneous pseudospin symmetry breaking based on the mean-field theory. CDW has the diagonal long-range order and it might suppress the superconductivity characterized by ODLRO. However, whether it could destroy superconductivity completely is an interesting and open question. In the mean field theory, the Hamiltonian for the coexistence of CDW and superconductivity is reduced to

$$H = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} \gamma_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} + \sum_{\mathbf{k}} (\Delta^* c_{-\mathbf{k}, \downarrow} c_{\mathbf{k}, \uparrow} + \Delta c_{\mathbf{k}, \uparrow}^\dagger c_{-\mathbf{k}, \downarrow}^\dagger) - \rho \sum_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}+\pi, \sigma} + N_{\Lambda} \frac{3}{2|U|} (\Delta^2 + \rho^2), \quad (9)$$

where $\Delta = \frac{2}{3} \frac{1}{N_{\Lambda}} \frac{1}{U} \sum_i e^{i\pi \cdot \mathbf{r}_i} \langle \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_i^+ \rangle$ and $\rho = \frac{2}{3} \frac{1}{N_{\Lambda}} \frac{1}{U} \sum_i e^{i\pi \cdot \mathbf{r}_i} \langle \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_i^z \rangle$. The kinetic energy is $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}} = -2t(\cos k_x + \cos k_y + \cos k_z)$. In this approximation, one finds that the ground state energy, kinetic energy and equation of order parameters depend only on the parameter $R = \sqrt{\Delta^2 + \rho^2}$, and the states with pure CDW and pure superconductivity are degenerated. However, we should point out that the supersolid has a unique non-degenerate ground state as shown beyond the mean-field theory [7,11].

Generally speaking, Meissner effect and zero resistance are two hallmarks of a superconductor. In this model, the current operator is

$$\mathbf{j}_0 = iet \sum_{i, \vec{\delta}, \sigma} \vec{\delta} c_{i+\vec{\delta}, \sigma}^\dagger c_{i, \sigma}, \quad (10)$$

where $\vec{\delta}$ is the lattice vector for the nearest neighbour sites. When the system is in the presence of a weak magnetic field, the linear response theory [15] tells us that the response current can be expressed by

$$\mathbf{j} = \mathbf{j}^d + \mathbf{j}^p, \quad (11)$$

where

$$j_{\mu}^d = -te^2 \sum_{i, \sigma} \langle g | c_{i+\mathbf{e}_{\mu}, \sigma}^\dagger c_{i, \sigma} + c_{i, \sigma}^\dagger c_{i+\mathbf{e}_{\mu}, \sigma} | g \rangle A_{\mu}(\mathbf{r}_i, t), \quad (12)$$

and

$$j_{\mu}^p = +i \sum_{i, i', \nu} \int dt' \langle g | [j_{0, \mu}(\mathbf{r}_i, t), j_{0, \nu}(\mathbf{r}'_i, t')] | g \rangle \theta(t - t') A_{\nu}(\mathbf{r}'_i, t'). \quad (13)$$

$\mathbf{e}_{\mu}$ is a unit vector along the direction $\mu = (x, y, z)$ and $|g\rangle$ is the ground state in the absence of the field. Furthermore,

$$j_i(\mathbf{q}, \omega) = -e^2 [\langle -K_i \rangle - R_{ij}(\mathbf{q}, \omega)] A_j(\mathbf{q}, \omega) \quad (14)$$

where

$$\langle K_i \rangle = -\frac{2}{3} \frac{1}{N_{\Lambda}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}^2}{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}} \quad (15)$$

and

$$R_{ij}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = -i \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dt}{2\pi} e^{i\omega t} \langle g | [j_i(\mathbf{q}, t), j_j(-\mathbf{q}, 0)] | g \rangle \theta(t). \quad (16)$$

The superfluid density is determined by [15,16]

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{n_s}{m}\right)^* &\equiv \langle -K_i \rangle - R_{ii}(q_i = 0, q_{j \neq i} \rightarrow 0, \omega = 0) \\ &= 8t^2 \frac{1}{N_{\wedge}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \sin^2 k_i \frac{\Delta^2}{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}^3} + \left(\frac{n_s}{m}\right)_{CDW} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $\left(\frac{n_s}{m}\right)_{CDW}$ is the superfluid density for a pure CDW state with $\rho = R$ and $\Delta = 0$. The pure CDW state here is an insulator [16] with

$$\left(\frac{n_s}{m}\right)_{CDW} = \frac{2}{3} \frac{1}{N_{\wedge}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} \frac{\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}^2}{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}} - 8t^2 \frac{1}{N_{\wedge}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \sin^2 k_x \frac{R^2}{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}^3} = 0. \quad (18)$$

Therefore, the superfluid density $\left(\frac{n_s}{m}\right)^*$ for the supersolid ground state with both CDW and superconductivity is proportional to Δ^2 and is always positive and nonzero as long as $\Delta \neq 0$. Furthermore, as the quasiparticle spectrum has a finite energy gap R , the Drude weight is equal to the superfluid weight [16]

$$\frac{D}{\pi e^2} \equiv \left(\frac{n}{m}\right)^* \equiv \langle -K_x \rangle - \text{Re}\{R_{ii}(q = 0, \omega \rightarrow 0)\} = \left(\frac{n_s}{m}\right)^* \neq 0 \quad (19)$$

which implies the zero resistance. The penetration depth for a supersolid is $\lambda_s = (4\pi n_s e^2 / mc^2)^{-1/2}$ and $\lambda_c = (\frac{4\pi e^2}{3c^2 N_{\wedge}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}^2}{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}})^{1/2}$ is the penetration depth for a pure superconductor with $\rho = 0$ and $\Delta = R$. We have

$$\lambda_s = (1 + \frac{\rho^2}{\Delta^2})^{1/2} \lambda_c \geq \lambda_c. \quad (20)$$

This expression indicates that the perfect diamagnetism arises as soon as ODLRO is present, i.e., $\Delta \neq 0$. When $\Delta \rightarrow 0$, λ_s approaches infinite, and the diamagnetism disappears. Hence, the order parameter Δ guarantees the superconductivity with both Meissner effect and zero resistance. λ_s will increase with the CDW order parameter ρ , thus, in the supersolid the CDW suppresses the superconductivity, but does not destroy it completely. In the negative U case on a cubic lattice, the SU(2) symmetry ensures that the ratio for ρ and Δ is fixed at $\rho/\Delta = 1/\sqrt{2}$ [7], which gives the value $\lambda_s = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \lambda_c$. Therefore, we conclude that the supersolid is a true superconductor, not an insulator as being claimed in the previous studies Ref. [12,17].

Before ending the paper, we would like to discuss some experimental implications of our results. The following discussions are only meaningful if the experimental samples can be approximately described by hamiltonians which contained the pseudospin SU(2) symmetry. The coexistence of CDW and superconductivity has been observed in several materials [18]. One common feature is that the critical temperature for the CDW is always greater than that for superconductivity. This phenomenon can be understood very naturally in our theory. Superconductivity is the product of U(1) symmetry breaking, and the SU(2) symmetry should be broken (producing CDW) before its subgroup U(1) is broken. Therefore, the critical temperature for CDW must not be less than that for superconductivity. The CDW has DLRO and always suppresses ODLRO. But the SU(2) symmetry guarantees the coexistence of both long-range orders at low temperatures.

The collective modes are the products of the spontaneous symmetry breaking. There are two branches of massless modes accompanying the appearance of CDW, but only one is experimentally observable due to the negative energy in the other branch for a finite momentum. After U(1) symmetry breaking, a new branch of massless mode should appear. The massless mode and massive mode correspond to the phase mode and amplitude mode in order parameter, thus, usually appear in pair [19]. The massive modes have been observed experimentally [20]. The number of modes is one if the system is CDW ground state and two if CDW is coexistent with superconductor, these numbers agree with our findings.

In summary, the CDW in the Hubbard model is the product of spontaneous pseudospin SU(2) symmetry breaking, and furthermore if its subgroup U(1) symmetry is also broken, there is coexistence of both CDW and superconductivity. The additional global and continuous symmetry breaking presents important and physically observable consequences, and makes a natural understanding of a supersolid.

1. For example, see P. W. Anderson, *Basic Notations of Condensed Matter Physics*, (Benjamin, 1983);
2. B. A. Jones, C. M. Varma, and J. W. Wilkins, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 125(1988).
3. C. N. Yang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 2144(1989).
4. C. N. Yang and S. C. Zhang, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **34**, 759(1990); C. N. Yang, *Phys. Lett.* **A161**, 292(1991).
5. S. C. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 120(1990); *Strongly Correlated Electron Systems II*, ed. by G. Baskaran *et al.*, (World Scientific), 1991.
6. S.Q Shen and Z.M Qiu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 4238(1993).
7. F.C Pu and S.Q Shen, *Phys. Rev.* **B50**, 16086(1994).
8. R. R. P. Singh, and R. T. Scalettar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66**, 3203(1991); A. G. Rojo, J. O. Sofo and Balseiro, *Phys. Rev.* **B42**, 10241(1990); J. O. Sofo, and C. A. Balseiro, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 896(1992).
9. H. Shiba, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **48**, 2171(1972); Y. Nagaoka, *ibid.*, **52**, 1716(1974); V. J. Emery, *Phys. Rev.* **B14**, 2989(1972); S. Robaszkiewicz, R. Micnac, and K. A. Chao, *Phys. Rev.* **B23**, 1447(1981).
10. R. Micnas, J. Ranninger, and S. Robaszkiewicz, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **62**, 3203(1991), and references therein.
11. E. Lieb, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 1201(1990)
12. V. Soni, and J. S. Thakur, *Phys. Rev.* **B48**, 12917(1993).
13. A. J. Heeger, S. Kivelson, J. R. Schrieffer, and W.-P. Su, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **60**, 781(1988).
14. J. Goldstone, *Nuov. Cim.* **19**, 154(1960); Y. Nambu and G. Jona-Lasinio, *Phys. Rev.* **122**, 345(1961); **124**, 246(1961); J. Goldstone, A. Salam and S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev.* **127**, 965(1962).
15. J. R. Schrieffer, *Theory of Superconductivity*, (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1964).
16. D. J. Scalapino, S. R. White, and S. C. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 2830(1992); *Phys. Rev.* **B47**, 7995(1993).

17. G. S. Tian, *Phys. Lett.* **A192**, 278(1994).
18. T. F. Smith, R. N. Shelton, and R. E. Schwall, *J. Phys.* **F4**, 2009(1974); A. J. Wilson, F. J. Disalvo, and S. Mahajan, *Adv. Phys.* **24**, 117(1975); C. Berthier, P. Molinie, and D. Jerome, *Solid State Communi.* **18**, 1393(1976).
19. P. A. Lee, T. M. Rice, and P. W. Anderson, *Solid State Commun.* **14**, 703(1974); C. A. Balseiro, and L. M. Falicov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **45**, 662(1980); P. B. Littlewood, and C. M. Varma, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **47**, 811(1981); *Phys. Rev.* **B26**, 4883(1982).
20. R. Sooryakumar, and M. V. Klein, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **45**, 660(1980); R. Sooryakumar, M. V. Klein, and R. F. Frindt, *Phys. Rev.* **B23**, 3222(1981).